DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 345 786 JC 920 266

AUTHOR	Spicer, Scot L.; Sanchez, Jorge R.
TITLE	Caught in the Shadows: Immigrant Educational Access -- The Amnesty Population.
INSTITUTION	Glendale Community Coll., CA. Planning and Research Office.
SPONS AGENCY	California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE	Apr 92
CONTRACT	89-0776
NOTE	56p.; A research project produced under contract from the Amnesty Educational Unit of the California Community Colleges.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Colleges; Economically Disadvantaged; Educationally Disadvantaged; *Educational Needs; English (Second Language); Foreign Workers; Hispanic Americans; *Limited English Speaking; *Mexican Americans; Minority Groups; Needs Assessment; Postsecondary Education; Two Year Colleges; *Undocumented Immigrants
IDENTIFIERS	*Amnesty; *Immigration Reform and Control Act 1986

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted by Glendale Community College (California) in 1991 to obtain information about amnesty applicants participating in programs offered by the California community colleges. Two sets of data were used for the study. The first set was collected as part of a spring 1989 needs assessment survey in English as a Second Language classrooms at 26 colleges (n=2,298), and the second was gathered through a 1991 telephone survey of students who had begun amnesty classes at three colleges in the fall of 1988-89 (n=293). Key findings included the following: (1) amnesty applicants of Mexican origin were a distinctive subpopulation within both the Latino communities and the ESL student population; (2) this amnesty group was greatly interested in education and related economic opportunities; (3) amnesty applicants' ability to participate in educational programs was constrained by a lack of information, weak educational background, a need to maintain employment, and parenting responsibilities; (4) the 40 hours of English language training mandated in the Amnesty Program was insufficient for the needs of the population; (5) English language usage by the group correlated positively with income; and (6) students receiving more support services demonstrated greater interest in pursuing educational opportunities. Recommendations focused on the improvement of research on, outreach to, and program design and delivery for the amnesty population. Appendixes contain the survey instruments and tallied responses. Fourteen references are included. (JSP)

ED345786

Caught in the Shadows:

Immigrant Educational Access -- The Amnesty Population

by

Scot L. Spicer
Glendale Community College

Jorge R. Sanchez
Coast Community College District

April, 1992

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Spicer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A research project produced under contract 89-0776
from the Amnesty Education Unit of the
California Community Colleges

JC 920206

Published by

Glendale Community College

PLANNING & RESEARCH OFFICE

1500 N. Verdugo Road, Glendale CA 91208-2894 ☐ (818) 240-1000 ext. 413

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
1107 NINTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814
(916) 445-8752

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CAUGHT IN THE SHADOWS:
Immigrant Educational Access -- The Amnesty Population

by

Scot L. Spicer
Glendale Community College

Jorge R. Sanchez
Coast Community College District

The paper summarizes findings about Amnesty applicants participating in programs offered by the California community colleges. The authors have used two sets of data on Amnesty applicants: The first was collected during a spring 1989 needs assessment survey in ESL classrooms at twenty-six colleges; the second was collected during a spring 1991 telephone survey of applicants who had begun Amnesty classes at three colleges in the fall of 1988-89. There were 2,598 Amnesty respondents in the 1989 sample and 293 respondents to the 1991 survey.

Three million individuals registered for the federal Amnesty program under the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986. The Act provided an opportunity for adults who were in the United States illegally to become citizens. These individuals are primarily Latino and heavily concentrated in the American southwest. The 1.7 million claimants in California represent nearly thirty percent of the state's adult Latino population, five percent of the state's total population, and twelve percent of the state's workforce.

Based on the findings which follow, the authors suggest that a new paradigm of thinking is needed to assist this population in obtaining educational opportunities and suggest that it focus on the household unit instead of the individual.

- **Amnesty applicants are a distinctive subpopulation of the immigrant and Latino communities.**

The 1989 survey allows the authors to compare Amnesty applicants whose origin was Mexico to other non-Amnesty Mexicans, other Latinos, and all non-Amnesty students in ESL classes. The Mexican Amnesty group had been in the country longest, was generally older than other groups, and had the highest percent -- 63 percent -- living in households of five or more.

The Amnesty group was significantly less educated than other ESL populations; both prior education and US high-school graduation rates were the lowest among comparison groups. A full fifty percent of the Amnesty group had only six years or less of schooling before entering the United States. Over half of the Amnesty students were in literacy programs or in the bottom two (of six) levels of the non-credit ESL curriculum, whereas less than 25 percent of all non-Amnesty students were in these classes. Similarly, 53 percent of the all non-Amnesty students were in credit ESL programs as compared to only 18 percent of the Amnesty group.

- **The Amnesty group is greatly interested in education and related economic opportunities.**

While extremely interested in learning English, Amnesty participants were far more interested in getting a job or getting a better job than the other comparison groups in the 1989 survey. This survey also included ten questions seeking to gauge interest in support services typically available to community college students. While all groups showed interest in these support services, the Amnesty group was more likely to indicate a "definite" interest than any of the others. As an example, 51 to 58 percent of the Amnesty group indicated that academic counseling, career planning, job placement, and legal/immigration services would "definitely" help them succeed with their educational goals. Not surprisingly, given their household characteristics, the Amnesty group was much more interested in child care to assist them in their educational goals: 43 percent versus 23 percent for all non-Amnesty students.

- **Applicants' abilities to participate have been constrained by their lack of information, weak educational background, a need to maintain employment, and parenting responsibilities.**

In addition to the weak educational background and high levels of interest in support services already noted, the Amnesty group was the most likely to be employed full-time at 74 percent, compared to 39 percent for all non-Amnesty students in the 1989 survey.

Respondents to the 1991 survey were also asked what prevented them from taking more language or training courses. Child care responsibilities, other home responsibilities, and scheduling conflicts with work were the prime reasons these individuals found it difficult to attend further educational programs.

- **The forty hours of English language training mandated in the Amnesty program was insufficient for the needs of the population.**

In the initial survey, all ESL groups indicated that it was "highly" important for them to learn English. Unfortunately, the expectations of the Amnesty group did not seem to match the reality of their English language backgrounds; they estimated that it would take them two years to learn English, and yet their backgrounds and commitment to instruction were such that at least twice as long would seem more realistic.

By the time of the 1991 survey, only 17.1 percent of the Amnesty applicants indicated that they had reached the level of English language usage they desired. These respondents indicated, however, that their English training had had important impacts: 31.4 percent reported that their improved English had helped them obtain a pay raise or better job; 68.4 percent said that it had generally helped them on the job; and 80.1 percent felt that they had gained a better understanding of American culture.

- **Students receiving more support services demonstrate greater interest in pursuing educational opportunities.**

It should be noted that each college participating in the 1991 survey approached the Amnesty, language-training program differently. The level of planned integration of Amnesty applicants into collegiate curriculum and support services varied across a wide spectrum. The three colleges participating in this study cover that spectrum: College A organized their program within

existing college activities including a strong support services component; College B mixed existing and separate structures; and College C essentially had a program which existed outside the rest of the institution.

A dramatic difference among the colleges from both programmatic and evaluation stand points is reflected by the reported educational goals of the former students. Interest in continuing their education to a college level outcome was reported by 44.2 percent of College A respondents, compared to 1.2 percent for College B and 9.9 percent for College C respondents. Conversely, while only 22.9 percent of College A respondents said they had no current educational goal, 75.6 percent of College B respondents and 55.7 percent of College C respondents had no current educational goal in 1991. While no singular cause can be demonstrated from this survey, the implication that information and support services are essential to moving the Amnesty population into educational programs is clear. Especially given the population's mobility, lack of prior education, and high interest in information, the suggestion that support services make a difference is evident.

• **English language usage by the group correlates positively with income.**

The respondents to the 1991 survey were asked to evaluate how often they used English in three different situations: at home, among friends and neighbors, and at work. Each of these items was scored on a Likert scale of descriptors with numeric values of: 1) never (0%), 2) seldom (25%), 3) sometimes (50%), 4) often (75%), or 5) all the time (100%). This coding provides a simple scale of English ability and some encouraging findings. A Pearson correlation coefficient was determined for the relationship between weekly income (hours of weekly employment times hourly wage) and English language usage (the combination of the three scores for usage reported at home, with friends and neighbors, and at work). A sizable, positive correlation of .39, significant at greater than the .01 level, was obtained. At this stage of investigation it is uncertain whether this is actually a predictive measure or an association measure. The result does suggest, however, that Amnesty applicants can make economic gains with English language acquisition.

The authors make five recommendations for serving this immigrant population:

1) ESL programs ought to maintain an on-going assessment of their students' backgrounds and support needs.
2) There is a need for programs to build on the strengths of the population served by creating inter-generational education programs for immigrant households.
3) California should develop inter-jurisdictional cooperation across the state's entire educational system.
4) An aggressive outreach program is needed if the Amnesty population is to achieve access to educational and economic opportunities.
5) More research is needed on the Amnesty population.

This research project was conducted under contract 89-0776 from the **Amnesty Education Unit** of the California Community Colleges. © 1992 Spicer/Sanchez. All rights reserved.

SUMMARY

This paper summarizes findings about Amnesty applicants participating in programs offered by the California community colleges. The authors have used two sets of data on Amnesty applicants: 1) The first was collected during a spring 1989 needs assessment survey in ESL classrooms; and 2) the second was collected during a separate telephone survey of Amnesty applicants who had begun Amnesty classes at three colleges in the fall of 1988-89. In general, the authors find that the Amnesty population suffers from informational and socio-economic barriers to the educational access envisioned within federal Amnesty legislation. The authors conclude that a new paradigm of thinking is needed to assist this population in obtaining educational opportunities and suggest that it focus on the household unit instead of the individual.

Findings:

- Amnesty applicants are a distinctive subpopulation of the immigrant and Latino communities.
- The Amnesty group is greatly interested in education and related economic opportunities.
- Applicants' abilities to participate have been constrained by their lack of information, weak educational background, a need to maintain employment, and parenting responsibilities.
- The forty hours of English language training mandated in the Amnesty program was insufficient for the needs of the population.
- English language usage by the group correlates positively with income.
- Students receiving more support services demonstrate greater interest in pursuing educational opportunities.

Recommendations:

- ESL programs ought to maintain an on-going assessment of their students' backgrounds and support needs.
- There is a need for programs to build on the strengths of the population served by creating inter-generational education programs for immigrant households.
- California should develop inter-jurisdictional cooperation across the state's entire educational system.
- An aggressive outreach program is needed if the Amnesty population is to achieve access to educational and economic opportunities.
- More research is needed on the Amnesty population.

INDEX

Introduction 1

Spring 1989 Classroom Survey 3

Background 3

Methodology 3

Findings 4

Table A: Selected Comparisons from Statewide Data . . . 6

Spring 1991 Telephone Survey 9

Background 9

Methodology 9

Findings 10

Table B: Educational Goals. . . . 11
Table C: Problems Preventing Further Education 11
Table D: Do You Intend To Be Naturalized? (by college) . . 12
Table E: Current Educational Goal (by college) 14

Discussion and Recommendations 17

Acknowledgements 22

Bibliography 23

Appendix A: Spring 1991 Amnesty Applicant Survey 25

Appendix B: Amnesty Student Telephone Survey Responses 30

Appendix C: Amnesty Sub-Sample Responses/Statewide ESL Survey. . 36

INTRODUCTION

Three million individuals registered for the federal Amnesty program under the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986. The Act provided an opportunity for adults who were in the United States illegally to become citizens. These individuals are primarily Latino and heavily concentrated in the American southwest. The 1.7 million claimants in California represent nearly thirty percent of the state's adult Latino population, five percent of the state's total population, and twelve percent of the state's workforce. California community colleges began to provide programs specifically for Amnesty applicants in 1988-89 following the passage of the IRCA legislation. Studies by the authors and others demonstrate that this population does not have well-developed, English-language or job skills and that their participation in economic and political affairs is slight. Addressing this population is one of the major education access questions of the decade, yet our knowledge about the group is limited.

The Amnesty claimants and their households are critical to the economic prosperity of many areas, and their access to educational programs and consequently better job opportunities will have a long-term impact. Because of what we see as major barriers to this population's participation in educational and economic opportunities, we have titled our report "Caught in the Shadows" in response to the 1989 study by California Tomorrow entitled, Out of the Shadows -- The IRCA/SLIAG Opportunity. Discussing federal legislation and the State Legalization Impact Assistance Grants (SLIAG), the California Tomorrow report concluded:

> "IRCA offers a unique opportunity for close to 2 million previously-undocumented aliens to become full participants in California's social, political and economic life. To realize this potential, California must utilize fully the opportunity under SLIAG to maximize the number of eligible aliens attaining permanent residency status, increase the number becoming U.S. citizens, and increase their levels of English literacy and basic skills. This task is enormous and must be accomplished in a short time." (p. 96)

While an extraordinary effort was assembled to address the educational component of the legalization process in California, the undertaking was hampered by a lack of knowledge about the population to be served. Amnesty applicants had far greater English language needs than anticipated. The group, while clearly interested in educational opportunities, was unfamiliar with the workings of the state's educational structure. Now, nearly four years later, the minimum requirements of the program initiated by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) do not seem to have been sufficient to provide the impetus necessary to move the Amnesty population into full participation in educational and economic opportunities; hence our perception that this population has not yet emerged from the shadows.

In addressing the issue of educational access for Amnesty applicants, the authors have used two data sets. The first survey, conducted in the spring of 1989, was a classroom survey of English-as-a-Second Language (ESL) students at 26 community colleges in California. Over 13,000 students were surveyed using nine translations of a questionnaire with specially designed scanable answer sheets. Among the respondents to the 1989 survey, 2,598 were self identified Amnesty applicants. This classroom survey gathered demographic characteristics, educational plans and interests, and support information needs from the respondents. The second survey, conducted by telephone in the spring of 1991, focused on the economic and educational experiences of students two years after beginning their initial Amnesty language class. The survey sought to determine some of the barriers to their participating in further education. Telephone surveyors reached 293 individuals out of 1,239 names provided by three community colleges in southern California.

SPRING 1989 CLASSROOM SURVEY

Background

Planning for the first of the two surveys began in the fall of 1987. At that time an effort to put together a consortium for the purpose of conducting a statewide survey of ESL students was organized by the Consortium for Community College English as a Second Language programs (CCCESL) which contacted the authors to participate in the effort. The project focused on the demographic characteristics, support-service needs, and educational interests of the students.

Resources were obtained from CCCESL and others to design and print a scanable answer sheet and the translation of the survey instrument into a variety of languages: Spanish; Korean; Vietnamese; Farsi; Chinese (Mandarin); Armenian; Hmong; Cambodian; and English. Additional details can be found in the November 1989 monograph Statewide Survey of ESL Student Populations: Overview (ED 311 978).

Methodology

Twenty-five schools surveyed their students during the spring of 1989, and 13,000 surveys were forwarded for processing. One college completed their survey during the fall of 1989. Individual colleges conducted the survey differently: Combined with the concentration of participants in the southern part of the state, there was no way to estimate how closely the collected sample matched the statewide ESL student population, but there were substantial samples from ten ethnic/nationality groups and a substantial population of self-identified Amnesty applicants in the final data base.

With respect to the Amnesty sample obtained, there are two reasons to believe that it may reasonably represent the Amnesty population in California. First, the sample is heavily concentrated in Los Angeles and Orange counties where a large

majority of the state's applicants live. Second, a general comparison with the 1989 A Survey of Newly Legalized Persons In California, conducted by the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS) for the California Health and Welfare Agency, shows close agreement on basic demographic variables.

Findings

Four groups will be discussed herein. The Amnesty group described in this paper will be limited to those specifically indicating that they were originally from Mexico and will be referred to as the *Amnesty* group. This population will be compared with both the other non-Amnesty, Mexican-origin population -- to be referred to as *other Mexican* -- and with all other non-Amnesty Latinos -- who will be referred to as *other Latinos*. For purposes of further comparison, the entire non-Amnesty population in the ESL classroom survey will be referred to as the *all non-Amnesty* group. (Appendix C provides an overview of the data collected for the entire Amnesty population captured in the 1989 classroom survey.)

These divisions of the sampled population help to clarify specific points about the Amnesty population. The authors stress, however, that Latino populations are not homogeneous and that the use of the "other Latino" data discussed here would not accurately reflect any one of the possible further divisions -- such as Central Americans or South Americans -- of this large and varied population. Table A on page six provides some selected comparisons between the four groups identified in this discussion.

The ESL course being taken was the first "college" experience for some 90 percent of each of the Latino populations in the sample -- the academic level of the courses varied from literacy to one-level below freshmen composition. A comparison of the Amnesty applicants with other groups, however, suggests that they are a distinctive group. Over half of the *Amnesty* and *other Mexican* students were in literacy programs or in the bottom two (of six) levels of a non-credit curriculum, whereas less

than 30 percent of the *other Latinos* and less than 25 percent of *all non-Amnesty* students were in these classes. Similarly, 53 percent of the *all non-Amnesty* and 48 percent of the *other Latinos* were in credit programs as compared to 26 percent of the *other Mexican* group and only 18 percent of the *Amnesty* group.

All individuals in these four groups indicated that it was "highly" important for them to learn English: How to understand spoken English; how to speak English; and how to read and write English. Unfortunately, the expectations of the Amnesty group did not seem to match the reality of their English language backgrounds; they estimated that it would take them two years to learn English, and yet, given their educational backgrounds and the amount of time they were dedicating to school, it would probably take them at least twice as long to achieve literacy in English.

Overall, the *Amnesty* group was less educated than other ESL populations; both prior education and US high-school graduation rates were lowest among the four comparison groups, as reflected in Table A. The number of school years completed before coming to the United States was very different among the groups; 50 percent of the *Amnesty* group had six years or less compared to 31 percent of the *other Mexican* group and 16 percent of the *other Latinos*. Similarly, the numbers reporting no English language training before entering the United States accounted for 75 percent of the *Amnesty* group, 61 percent for the *other Mexican*, and 50 percent for the *other Latinos*. Only 24 percent of the *Amnesty* group reported either a foreign high school or American high school diploma, 75 percent of the *other Latinos* said they had completed a high school diploma.

Among the *Amnesty* group, the secondary goal to learning English was more likely to be getting a job or getting a better job than among the *other Mexican* group and far more so than for *other Latinos*. The reverse was the case for interest in college programs, with the *Amnesty* group having the least interest. The *Amnesty* group was the most likely to be employed full-time (31 hours per week or more) at 74 percent,

Table A:

Selected Comparisons from the Statewide ESL Classroom Data

	Mexican Amnesty	Non-Amnesty: Other Mexican	Non-Amnesty: Other Latinos	All Non-Amnesty
Demographics				
% Male	60	55	44	48
% Married with Children	43	29	30	28
% Single w/o Kids	37	55	47	67
% Working full-time	74	62	55	39
% 5 or more in Household	63	59	41	45
Median Hours Worked/Week	31-40	31-40	31-40	16-20
Median Current Age	26-30	22-25	26-30	22-25
% in US to stay by 1981	64	32	28	23
Median Years/School before US	6	9	12	12
% with 6 years or less foreign School	50	32	16	22
% Foreign High School Grad.	22	36	67	59
% US High School Grad	2	6	8	13
% No English before coming to US	75	61	50	39
% No English prior to current class	47	47	32	32
Educational Plans				
Highly Important/Understand English	84	84	90	79
Highly Important/Write English	77	77	84	71
% Desiring Job/Better Job	65	52	36	37
% Desiring Some College	23	34	46	51
% Desiring BA degree or higher	11	24	30	35
Support Needs				
% Def. Desire Academic Counseling	51	50	49	36
% Def. Desire Career Planning	58	57	54	40
% Def. Desire Legal/Immig. Assist.	58	51	41	31
% Def. Desire Job Placement	52	51	46	34
% Def. Desire Child Care	43	35	33	23
% Rating Instruction as Excellent	64	53	47	35
% Always Comfortable in USA	53	41	39	28
	(N=1,828)	(N=2,687)	(N=1,446)	(N=10,506)

compared to 62 percent for the *other Mexican* group, 55 percent for the *other Latinos*, and 39 percent for all non-Amnesty students.

The household characteristics present some of the most interesting features of the Amnesty population. The *Amnesty* group was at least twice as likely to have arrived in the United States before 1981 with the intent of staying than any other group - 64 percent of the group -- compared to 32 percent for the next highest group, but they tended to be only slightly older. The *Amnesty* population was 60 percent male compared to 55 percent male for the *other Mexican* and 44 percent for the *other Latinos*. *Amnesty* students were the least likely to be single -- 37 percent compared to 55 percent for *other Mexican* and 47 percent for *other Latinos*. In fact, the model *Amnesty* household was relatively large with three adults and two pre-teens. Some 63 percent of the Amnesty households had five or more people. This figure was slightly greater than the *other Mexican*, but half-again greater than the *other Latino* groups in the survey who had only 41 percent of their households with five or more people. (The CASAS Survey found the genders to be balanced in their survey sample of Amnesty applicants and 57 percent of the households to be of five or larger. Immigration and Naturalization Service figures indicate that the Amnesty population has more males than females {CASAS, p. 2-7}.)

The classroom survey had asked respondents to indicate participation in any of six programs -- in addition to Amnesty -- considered likely to provide them with support. Among all Amnesty applicants, no more than five (5) indicated participation in AWARE, CARE, GAIN, JPTA, or Refugee programs. Twenty-five (25) indicted that they were participating in the college based EOPS (Extended Opportunity Program and Services) programs. Given this lack of exposure to programs, the group's strong interest in information about support services is encouraging.

The survey included ten questions seeking to gauge interest in support services typically available to community college students. In each case, the service was

carefully described within the survey item (see Appendix C). While all groups showed interest in these support services, the *Amnesty*, *other Mexican*, and *other Latino* groups were each more likely to indicate a "definite" interest than the overall survey sample. As an example, 51 to 58 percent of the *Amnesty* group indicated that academic counseling, career planning, job placement, and legal/immigration services would "definitely" help them succeed with their educational goals. This level of interest is contrasted with 31 to 40 percent by the *all non-Amnesty* sample stating that these services would definitely help them achieve their educational goal. Not surprisingly, given their household characteristics, the *Amnesty* group was much more interested in child care to assist them in their educational goals: 43 percent versus 23 percent for *all non-Amnesty* students.

The *Amnesty* population was also the most generous of all groups in rating the instruction they were receiving, with 64 percent designating it "excellent". They were also the most likely to indicate that they "always" felt comfortable in the United States: 53 percent of the Amnesty group said so; compared to 41 percent of the *other Mexican* group, 39 percent of the *other Latinos*, and 28 percent of *all non-Amnesty* individuals in the sample.

SPRING 1991 TELEPHONE SURVEY

Background

The authors responded to a request for proposals during the spring of 1990 by the Amnesty Education Unit of the California Community Colleges and offered to compare the Amnesty students attending community colleges in the spring of 1989 with a new survey of these previous students. Working with the Amnesty Education Unit of the Chancellor's Office, the authors proposed a two step plan. First, a review of the data on Amnesty applicants from the 1989 classroom survey of ESL students would be done; this review was presented in the preceding section of this paper. Second, a telephone survey of Amnesty applicants entering the community colleges in 1988-89 would be initiated. The new survey would seek follow-up information about students participating in Amnesty programs and examine the possibility of providing future training at their work sites.

By March 1991, three community colleges in Los Angeles and Orange counties had agreed to participate in the project -- these institutions will be identified as Colleges A, B, and C. College A had a highly developed and extensive computer-based information system on their students; College B had a basic computer-based information system on their students; and College C had paper files which were manually reviewed by project staff to identify the sample population.

Methodology

Once participating institutions had been identified, a Spanish language instructor was hired to translate the survey instrument into Spanish (the English version is provided as Appendix A). This instructor worked with the project staff to interview, train, and supervise three student interviewers who were completely fluent in both Spanish and English. The telephone interviews were conducted between May and July of 1991 with individuals identified as having entered classes under the auspices of Amnesty during the fall of 1988-89 at Colleges A, B, and C.

Findings

In general, those reached by telephone seemed to have similar demographics to the overall sample, and given the sample size, there is a ninety percent certainty that their responses are representative. However, the high mobility of this population -- reflected in our reaching less than 25 percent of the sample -- does cause some concern. The complete data from the 1991 telephone survey is provided in Appendix B. Overall, more than half of the sample population was not reached because of an incorrect telephone number: Either there was no telephone number of record for the student (6.6%); the number was disconnected (13.8%); or the individual was no longer at the number of record (34.5%). Other telephone numbers belonged to businesses where the individual no longer worked; there were a few individuals who declined to participate, and no one ever answered the telephone at 17.4 percent of the numbers.

Some 73.7 percent of the Amnesty applicants were working; more than half were working full-time. Of those reached, 93.4 percent worked for only one employer and 93.2 percent were working in the private sector. There was a clear gender difference with respect to employment: 86.5 percent of the males were working while only 62 percent of the females were working. Slightly under one-quarter of the individuals indicated a job change since January 1989, while 31.4 percent reported that the English language classes taken for Amnesty had helped them obtain a pay raise or better job.

The possibility of providing English and/or job training at the employment site appears to be problematic. About half of the Amnesty population reported being self-employed or in firms of under 26 employees, and only 27.3 percent reported that there was a "cafeteria, classroom, or other large room where classes could be held" at their employment site. On the other hand, among the 21.6 percent who had been provided with training by their employer, better than three-quarters of the training had been conducted at the work site. We suspect, however, that much of this training was probably one-on-one direction in the use of particular equipment.

The respondents indicated that their English training had had other impacts: 68.4 percent said that it had helped them on their job, and 80.1 percent felt they had gained a better understanding of American culture. On the other hand, only 17.1 percent had reached the level of English language usage they desired, and more than half had no further educational plans. Their responses to questions relating to their educational goals are reported in Tables B and C below. Respondents were given an open-ended question which was then coded into the categories indicated.

Table B:
Educational Goals

10.4%	To gain skills so I can get a job
3.2%	To improve my job skills to get a better job
.4%	Parenting/raising children in America
.7%	Some college, no degree
8.6%	A 2-year college degree
5.0%	A 4-year college degree
2.2%	A graduate/professional degree
5.0%	A professional/vocational License
10.8%	Other
53.6%	None

Respondents were also asked what prevented them from taking more language or training courses. They were encouraged to respond with as many problems as came to mind. Again, responses to an open-ended question were coded by the interviewer into the categories indicated in Table C below. Child care responsibilities, other home responsibilities, and scheduling conflicts with work were the prime

Table C:
Problems Preventing Further Education

7.2%	Don't want any more classes
41.6%	Child care responsibilities
32.8%	Conflicts with Work
4.8%	Conflicts with household/family responsibilities
3.8%	Transportation (to or from)
6.5%	Cost/Fees
4.1%	Lost Income
.3%	Admission Policy -- restriction of non-citizen
18.1%	Other

reasons these individuals found it difficult to attend further educational programs.

In the 1989 CASAS survey some 78 percent of the respondents indicated that they intended to apply for citizenship. Two years later, however, only 51.7 percent of the 1991-telephone-survey group said that they intended to become naturalized citizens. This response may have been related to confusion about the process -- many respondents asked the interviewers what they should do next. Thirty-four percent of the Amnesty applicants reported that they had no further steps remaining before naturalization.

The telephone survey was designed to assess current educational interests and general barriers to attaining further education; it was not specifically aimed at evaluating other access issues, but the results suggest that we *should*. By breaking the survey results out by college, a much broader set of questions arises. It is striking how much some of the responses varied by college attended. Of particular interest is the different degrees of intention to naturalize shown among the groups of respondents from the three colleges (see Table D below). We have no immediate explanation for why students from College A would be twice as likely to plan on naturalizing as those from College B.

Table D:
Do You Intend To Be Naturalized?

	Yes	No	Unsure
College A	76.8%	13.0%	10.1%
College B	38.2%	41.6%	20.2%
College C	47.7%	27.3%	25.0%
Overall	**51.7%**	**28.3%**	**19.9%**

The authors sense that the nature of the communities served by each college is worthy of investigation. A review of the initial 1990 Census data suggests that each college serves neighborhoods which have different concentrations of Latinos. High concentrations of an immigrant population in an area may make it easier to survive without much participation in the English-speaking community and thereby reduce interest in naturalization.

Before covering the second item which produced particularly different responses among the institutions, it should be noted that each college approached the Amnesty language training program differently. The level of planned integration of Amnesty applicants into collegiate curriculum and support services varied across a wide spectrum. The three colleges participating in this study cover that spectrum: College A organized their program within existing college activities including a greatly enhanced support services component; College B mixed existing and separate structures; and College C essentially had a program which existed entirely outside of the rest of the institution.

College A organized their program on the main college campus and provided one hour of group counseling by a member of the regular college staff as part of each week's English language courses. The applicants were placed into regularly scheduled credit and non-credit ESL or English classes.

College B organized their program at a regular community site where only non-credit courses were taught. The director reports that "about half" of their Amnesty population received a counselor meeting. The applicants took the institution's regular non-credit ESL courses with a special civics component to meet the INS requirements for residency.

College C organized the courses on their main college campus with a curriculum created entirely for the Amnesty program and focused heavily on the

applicants' need to complete 40 hours of language instruction along with a civics component. While the institution did not treat the program as a regular instructional activity, the individuals hired to teach the classes were, for the most part, regular faculty at the college.

A dramatic difference among the colleges from both programmatic and evaluation stand points is reflected by the reported educational goals of the former students. While no singular cause can be demonstrated from this survey, the implication that information and support services are essential to moving the Amnesty population into educational programs is clear. Especially given the population's mobility, lack of prior education, and high interest in information, the suggestion that support services make a difference is evident in Table E below. Interest in a college level education was reported by 44.2 percent of College A respondents, compared to 1.2 percent for College B and 9.9 percent for College C respondents. Conversely, while only 22.9 percent of College A respondents said they had no current educational goal, 75.6 percent of College B respondents and 55.7 percent of College C respondents had no current educational goal.

Table E:
Current Educational Goal

	College A	College B	College C
To gain skills so I can get a job	11.4%	4.7%	13.9%
To improve my job skills to get a better job	5.7%	3.5%	1.6%
Parenting/raising children in America	n/a	1.2%	n/a
Some college, no degree	n/a	1.2%	.8%
A 2-year college degree	***21.4%***	1.2%	6.6%
A 4-year college degree	***15.7%***	n/a	2.5%
A graduate/professional degree	***7.1%***	n/a	.8%
A professional/vocational License	10.0%	1.2%	4.9%
Other	5.7%	11.6%	13.1%
None	22.9%	***75.6%***	***55.7%***

While prior background variables and community variables can not be controlled for in the sample, the possibility that information and access to support services contributed to elevating the confidence and aspirations among students at College A raises a clear need for more research on both the educational services offered to the Amnesty population and their resulting expectations.

The differences in naturalization intent and educational goals between college samples caused the authors to investigate other differences by college in the sample: A majority of students at both Colleges B and C reported attending for only one semester. Less than 30 percent of the College A respondents, however, stayed for just one semester, and 42 percent of those at College A completed twelve or more units. Of the 31 respondents from College A who stated an interest in further college education, 22 had completed twelve or more units. College A had more students reporting that they had reached the level of English desired, 31 percent versus 17 percent at College B and 9 percent at College C

This preliminary analysis from the telephone survey project identifies a population whose appreciation for educational opportunities seems to be enhanced by the provision of support services. What then can be expected from developing their interest in educational programs? In the telephone survey, respondents were asked to evaluate how often they used English in three different situations: at home, among friends and neighbors, and at work. Each of these items was scored on a Likert scale of descriptors with numeric values of: 1) never (0%), 2) seldom (25%), 3) sometimes (50%), 4) often (75%), or 5) all the time (100%); a response structure developed to insure equal understanding across languages. This coding provides a simple scale of English ability and some encouraging findings. A Pearson correlation was determined for the relationship between weekly income (hours of weekly employment times hourly wage) and English language usage (the combination of the three scores for usage reported at home, with friends and neighbors, and at work). The resulting correlation appears on the next page:

	English Language Use
Weekly Income	.3921
	(187)
	P = .000

A sizable, positive correlation -- significant at greater than the .01 level -- was obtained (meaning that there is less than a 1% probability that the finding is based on chance occurrence). The combined scale correlation with weekly income was greater than the correlation for any one of the separate language usage situations. At this stage of investigation it is uncertain whether this is actually a predictive measure or an association measure. The result does suggest, however, that Amnesty applicants can make economic gains with English language acquisition.

A similar determination of correlation between English language use and the amount of education attained since Amnesty was obtained using a four point scale equating units and semesters of attendance for the amount of education: 1 to 3 units/one semester; 4 to 6 units/2 or 3 semesters; 7 to 11 units/4 to 6 semesters; and 12 or more units/7 or more semesters. (The combination of units and semesters was necessary due to a variation in the way the information was provided for students from each institution.) The English-language-use scale and amount-of-education scales were also positively correlated, .4568 at a greater than .01 level of significance. Since a majority of the applicants' educational experience was English-language training, we should expect a relationship between these two scales. That there were these positive relationships, however, is encouraging and provides further evidence that educational programs will assist Amnesty applicants in achieving greater economic success.

DISCUSSION and RECOMMENDATIONS

The ESL programs of the California community colleges serve many distinct populations. The Amnesty group represents a unique population with different backgrounds and support needs from other groups served. The Amnesty population's recent arrival to the educational process and their interest in support services suggest a considerable need for assistance in obtaining access to the system. Their lack of familiarity with the workings of the educational system is probably a reflection of the group's general social isolation. This population does not have to use much English; they do not follow English language media; and generally, they reside in neighborhoods where only Spanish is needed for survival. While they have been in the United States longer than any other population in the classroom survey, the Amnesty population has the least amount of education. On the other hand, with some 65 percent expressing interest in the potential for job opportunities gained from learning English, there is an awareness on their part of the need for education in the pursuit of economic benefit.

We do not find the survey results to be particularly promising for the prospects of job-site training. Because most of the Amnesty claimants are employed in small firms, we suspect that reaching most of this population will require alternative approaches.

Part of the challenge in serving the Amnesty population comes from its historic isolation from educational and governmental programs. The group says they are comfortable living in the United States, yet they are weak in English-language and general-educational skills. Creative programs with a greater understanding of the household unit are needed to facilitate adult access to education and economic opportunity. Such programs could also support achievement among the children of Amnesty households. This challenge requires evaluation, planning, and action across all sectors of the state's educational system. We offer five recommendations based on our experiences in developing this research project.

1) ESL programs ought to maintain an on-going assessment of their students' backgrounds and support needs.

The 1989 classroom survey found dramatic differences among the populations served by ESL programs in the community colleges of California. With such a wide variety of educational backgrounds, household structures, and employment characteristics present among the immigrant population, an on-going needs assessment and programmatic evaluation seems advisable in order to serve all the different groups present.

Curriculum, scheduling, and student expectations should be reviewed constantly. We can not assume that one method or approach to instruction will serve everyone. The state's rapidly growing ESL population -- with its ethnic diversity and divergent educational backgrounds -- requires the constant adjustment of instructional programs to serve each institution's immigrant population. Especially when recognizing the large share of ESL instruction delivered by part-time faculty, the importance of institutional awareness and planning for the needs of ESL students is essential to move this population into full participation in educational opportunities. Data from the 1991 telephone survey make especially clear the need for planning and commitment on the part of those serving the Amnesty population.

2) There is a need for programs to build on the strengths of the population served, such as creating inter-generational education programs for immigrant households.

The provision of adult education typically assumes that students have few barriers to participation; yet, clearly in the case of the Amnesty population, we are dealing with a group facing tremendous barriers to participation in education. At the same time our K-12 educational system faces the challenge of educating today's large and diverse immigrant population. Increasingly, the state's educational institutions

must deal with structural inconsistencies between student needs and institutional offerings. Immigrant adults and children are frequently in the same households and both groups desire educational opportunities when they understand the system and are not constrained from participation by economic problems.

Hayes-Bautista has noted the work ethic, lack of dependence on government programs, and high rate of family formation among the immigrant Latino population; he calls for research to support the group's strengths while addressing their educational and income needs (1989). Perhaps one way to do this would be through greater investment in inter-generational educational programs. Some have referred to the idea of "jump start" programs where immigrant parents and children could learn together -- essentially Head-Start-type programs for parents and children. Such programs, with day, evening, and weekend scheduling, would alleviate child care barriers, while improving household commitment to education.

The *Los Angeles Times* has reported on a few parenting programs designed for the immigrant population which help parents cope with the ideas and experiences their children bring home from school (2/11/92). Such programs take advantage of the strong family unit. This type of program could also strengthen the likelihood of positive environmental factors for the children's achievement through the development of appropriate support and feedback from both teachers and parents. (See Alva and Padilla, 1989).

California ought to develop programs which take on the challenge of educating both immigrant parents and their children in conjunction. Immigrant children and parents can be torn apart by the new ideas and expectations the children are exposed to in school (see Olsen, 1988). The educational futures of immigrant children are put at risk by having their lives divided between two cultures and two languages. Adult immigrants are constrained from participation in educational opportunities by both their economic need to work and their responsibilities as parents. Why not address

the educational access problems through the household? If parents and children could be incorporated in similar programs many positive outcomes might be achieved: The stress of the two generations participating in different cultures could be reduced. Learning by both generations could be enhanced. An understanding about educational structures and expectations could be developed in both generations, leaving parents more able to give positive support to their children's educational undertakings as well as understanding the opportunities afforded to themselves.

3) California should develop inter-jurisdictional cooperation across the entire educational system.

The need for inter-jurisdictional cooperation stems directly from the previous recommendation. Efforts should be made to facilitate cooperation among different educational sectors combining their respective expertise to deliver simultaneous and/or parallel programs for adults and children. This might involve sharing instructional responsibilities and facilities while collecting separate attendance funding. The social benefits of such efforts would be great.

4) An aggressive outreach program is needed if the Amnesty population is to achieve access to educational and economic opportunities.

Both the 1989 classroom survey and 1991 telephone interviews clearly demonstrate the need to provide information to the Amnesty population about educational opportunities. The population's legal status and background has thus far hindered their access to education and job training, but they are interested in education and the economic opportunities it can provide. The challenge is critical; Latinos are concentrated in sectors of the economy which are expected to contract in the next ten to fifteen years with little educational preparation to compete for better jobs (OCQ, page 44). The Amnesty process required minimal educational participation. This participation was often not carefully tied to other educational opportunities.

Federal and state agencies should support educational institutions which have the commitment and flexibility to aggressively serve this population.

Moving Amnesty recipients into broader economic opportunities rests heavily on developing English literacy within the population. (See Vernez and McCarthy, 1990 and the Tomas Rivera Center Studies, 1989a & 1989b.) Of particular concern is the group's minimal prior education; the Amnesty population has half the educational attainment of the non-Amnesty population in our survey (and of the requirements for a median income job in California). The CASAS survey included a language assessment which found 81 percent of the population "below the minimal functional level of English language proficiency" (p. 4-2 to 4-4). This minimal functional level equals the level of English fluency necessary to benefit from job training programs . Faculty at the three colleges participating in the 1991 telephone survey verified this assessment; they indicated that their greatest challenge in teaching English to the Amnesty population was the group's lack of literacy in any language.

5) More research is needed on the Amnesty population.

Our research suggests the need for on-going assessment of immigrant populations with special attention paid to their specific educational needs. In addition to their prior legal status, the ability of Amnesty applicants to benefit from education has been constrained by their need to maintain employment and by low appreciation of educational opportunities. Two of the questions further research must address are: 1) the economic structure of the household and its survival skills; and 2) the cultural attribution issues which underlie differing expectations of educational access and life opportunities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Saeed Ali, Weaver Rhyne, and Juan Cruz of the Chancellor's Office were the shepherds and mentors for this project. Sam Black of Glendale Community College acted with understanding as fiscal officer.

The authors wish to thank Dr. John A. Davitt and the Board of Trustees of Glendale Community College, and Dr. Ken Ygelsias, Dr. Alfred P. Fernandez and the Trustees of the Coast Community College District for their support, interest, and encouragement.

Fred Wells provided editorial assistance and constructive insights. Alicia Galindo was our official translator. Alicia was joined by Silvia Gimenez, Laura Gimenez, and Jackie Tallarico in conducting the telephone interviews. Evelyn Aghekian provided most of the manual data gathering and all of the computer entry required for the project. We thank them all.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alva, Sylvia Alatorre and Padilla, Amado M. (1989). *A Contextual Interaction Model of Academic Invulnerability Among Mexican American Students.* Report 89-CERAS-03. Palo Alto, CA: Center for Educational Research at Stanford.

California Tomorrow (1989). *Out of the Shadows -- The IRCA/SLIAG Opportunity.* Report 89-10. Sacramento, CA: California Postsecondary Education Commission.

Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System -- CASAS (1989). *A Survey of Newly Legalized Persons In California.* San Diego, CA: CASAS.

Hayes-Bautista, David (1989). *Latino Adolescents, Families, Work, and the Economy: Building Upon Strength or Creating A Weakness?* Washington, D.C: A concept paper prepared for the Carnegie commission on Adolescent Development.

Los Angeles Times, Orange County (2/11/92). *Parenting the American Way.* Los Angeles, CA: Times-Mirror Company.

Los Angles Times (1983). *Southern California's Latino Community.* Los Angeles, CA: Times Mirror Company.

Occupational Outlook Quarterly (Winter 1991/92). *OQChart: Hispanics will enter the labor force in record numbers between 1990 and 2005.* Vol. 35 No. 4, Washington, D.C.: The Quarterly.

Olsen, Laurie and Chen, Marcia T. (1988). *Crossing the Schoolhouse Border: Immigrant Students and the California Public Schools.* San Francisco, CA: California Tomorrow.

Ong, Paul et al. (1989) *The Widening Divide: Income Inequality and Poverty in Los Angeles.* Los Angeles, CA: The Research Group on the Los Angeles Economy.

Population Research Unit (1990). *Estimates of Refugees in California Counties and the State: 1988.* Report SR 88-1. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Finance.

Spicer, Scot L., Sanchez, Jorge R., and Ali, Saeed (1989). *Statewide Survey of ESL Student Populations.* Glendale, CA: Glendale Community College. [Ed 312 021]

The Tomas Rivera Center (1989a). *At the Crossroads of Poverty and Affluence: A Latino Funding Agenda for Orange County.* Claremont, CA: The Center.

The Tomas Rivera Center (1989b). *One Voice, One Future: A Latino Funding Agenda from the Latino Community and its Leadership.* Claremont, CA: The Center.

Vernez, Georges and McCarthy, Kevin (1990). *Meeting the Economy's Labor Needs Through Immigration.* Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

APPENDIX A

Spring 1991 Amnesty Applicant Survey

Hello, may I speak with _____ .

Hello, this is _____, calling from the California Community Colleges. We are conducting a survey of Amnesty applicants who were enrolled in an education program during the fall of 1988. We would like to ask you some questions about your educational interests and would greatly appreciate your assistance.

This survey is completely confidential, and after I record your responses, your name will not used in any way, nor will anyone else know your responses.

(Would it be more comfortable for you to conduct our conversation in
_____ Spanish or _____ English)

1a) How many of hours of employment are you paid for each week (typically)? _____

1b) How many employers/different jobs do you have? _____*

(*If more than one: 1c) How many hours a week is your primary job? _____)

2) What kind of work do you do? (primary job only)

_____

_____

3) Have you had a job change since January, 1989?
Yes _____ (1) No _____ (0)

4) About how many people are employed at your (primary) work site? _____

(0) Self employed ____
(1) 1-5 _____
(2) 6-15 _____
(3) 16-25 _____
(4) 26-50 _____
(5) 51-100 _____
(6) 101+ _____

5) Is your (primary) employer a city, the county, the state or the federal government?
Yes _____ (1) No _____ (0)

6) Does your (primary) employment site have a cafeteria, classroom, or other large room where classes could be held?

Yes _____(1) No _____(0) Don't Know _____(2)

7a) Has your employer provided you with any training?

_____ *Yes (1) _____ No (0)

*What type? (below)

7b) English: Yes _____(1) No _____(0)
7c) Technical: Yes _____(1) No _____(0)
(using job related equipment, other than equipment safety)

7d) Other (describe)_____

_____

7e) Where did the training occur:
(1) _____ at the work site
(2) _____ elsewhere

8) Have you taken any time off from work in the last 12 months due to an accident at work?
Yes _____* (1) No _____ (0)

9) On average, how much do you usually earn per hour for working? (primary job)

_____

_____ (0) not employed
_____ (1) under $4.25 per hour
_____ (2) $4.25 per hour
_____ (3) Between $4.26 and $6.25 per hour
_____ (4) Between $6.26 and $8.25 per hour
_____ (5) Between $8.26 and $10.25 per hour
_____ (6) Between $10.26 and $12.25 per hour
_____ (7) $12.26 or more per hour

10) Have the English language classes you have taken for Amnesty helped you:

10a) with your job (understanding directions, safety, etc.)?
Yes _____ (1) No _____ (0)

10b) to get a pay raise or to get a better paying job?
Yes _____ (1) No _____ (0)

10c) to understand American culture?
Yes _____ (1) No _____ (0)

11) Do you intend to become a naturalized citizen after November 1991?

Yes _____ (1) No _____ (0)

12a) Are there any steps remaining for you to complete before naturalization?

Yes _____* (1) No _____ (0)

*12b) If "Yes": What are they?

_____

13) Other than learning English, do you have a ***current*** educational goal or any goal that would require you to go to school?

_____
(If "none" -- skip item #16)

___(1) To gain skills so I can get a job
___(2) To improve my job skills to get a better job
___(3) Parenting/raising children in America
___(4) Some college, no degree
___(5) A 2-year college degree
___(6) A 4-year college degree
___(7) A graduate/professional degree
___(8) A professional/vocational License
___(9) Other: _____
___(0) None

14) Have you reached the level of English Language usage you desire?

Yes _____ (1) No _____ (0)

15) What kind of job would you like to have 5 years from now?

_____

16) (If they had an educational goal on #13) Given your current schedule, what times of the week and day would you be interested and able to take classes?

_____

M-F 8-12 _____(16a)	Sat 8-12 _____ (16d)	Sun 8-12 _____ (16g)
M-F 1-5 _____ (16b)	Sat 1-5 _____ (16e)	Sun 1-5 _____ (16f)
M-F 6-10 _____ (16c)	Sat 6-10 _____ (16f)	Other _____ (16i)

17) What problems (do you have which) prevent you from taking more language or training courses?

_____

(17a)_____ Don't wish any more classes
(17b) _____ Child care responsibilities
(17c) _____ Conflicting times with Work
(17d) _____ Conflicts with household/family responsibilities
(17e) _____ Transportation (to or from)
(17f) _____ Cost/Fees
(17g) _____ Lost Income
(17h) _____ Admission Policy -- restriction of non-citizen
(17i) _____ Other

For the last three questions, I would like you to use the following responses for your answers:

All the time -- 100%
Often -- 75%
Sometimes -- 50%
Seldom -- 25%
Never -- 0%

18) How often do you use English at home?.

_____ (5) All the time -- 100%
_____ (4) Often -- 75%
_____ (3) Sometimes -- 50%
_____ (2) Seldom -- 25%
_____ (1) Never -- 0%

19) Among your friends and neighbors, how often do you use English?

_____ (5) All the time -- 100%
_____ (4) Often -- 75%
_____ (3) Sometimes -- 50%
_____ (2) Seldom -- 25%
_____ (1) Never -- 0%

20) While at work, how often do you use English?

_____ (5) All the time -- 100%
_____ (4) Often -- 75%
_____ (3) Sometimes -- 50%
_____ (2) Seldom -- 25%
_____ (1) Never -- 0%
_____ (0) Not employed

Copyright © (In translations) 1991 Spicer/Sanchez. All rights reserved.

APPENDIX B
Amnesty Student
Telephone Survey Responses
SPRING, 1991

COLLEGE SAMPLE:

Original List			Sample Reached		
College A	334	27.0%	College A	71	24.2%
College B	295	23.8%	College B	91	31.1%
College C	610	49.2%	College C	131	44.7%
Total	*1239*		*Total*	*293*	

STATUS OF CONTACT:

Business	17	1.4%
Completed	**293**	**23.6%**
Disconnected	171	13.8%
Not at Number	427	34.5%
No Telephone	82	6.6%
Declined to Participate	27	2.2%
Other Language	6	.5%
Never Reached	216	17.4%
Total	*1239*	

GENDER:

Original List			Sample Reached		
Male	592	47.8%	Male	130	44.4%
Female	647	52.2%	Female	163	55.6%

ETHNICITY:

Original List			Sample Reached		
Asian	14	1.1%	Asian	2	.7%
Hispanic	507	40.9%	Hispanic	284	96.9%
Filipino	19	1.5%	Filipino	0	0.0%
Unknown	707	57.1%	Unknown	7	2.4%

MEDIAN AGE:

Original List	Sample
32	33

Q1a: How many of hours of employment are you paid for each week (typically)?

Not Employed	26.3%
1 to 10 hours	2.0%
11 to 20 hours	3.4%
21 to 30 hours	6.5%
31 to 40 hours	54.3%
41 or over	4.4%
Missing	3.1%

Q1b: How many employers/different jobs do you have?

One	93.4%
More	7.6%

Q2: What kind of work do you do? (primary job only)

Not Working	77	
Food Service	18	8.3%
Labor	59	27.3%
Clerical	14	6.5%
Technical	3	1.4%
Medical Assist.	7	3.2%
Manager	12	5.6%
Housekeeper	35	16.2%
Custodian	10	4.6%
Construction	15	6.9%
Transportation	10	4.6%
Salesperson	13	6.0%
Misc. Services	6	2.8%
Missing	9	4.2%
Other	5	2.3%

Q3: Have you had a job change since January, 1989?

Yes	22.8%
No	77.2%

Q4: About how many people are employed at your (primary) work site?

Self employed	10	4.8%
1-5	44	21.1%
6-15	32	15.3%
16-25	26	12.4%
26-50	36	17.2%
51-100	13	6.2%
101+	48	23.0%

Q5: Is your (primary) employer a city, the county, the state or the federal government?

Yes	6.8%
No	93.2%

Q6: Does your (primary) employment site have a cafeteria, classroom, or other large room where classes could be held?

Yes	27.3%
No	69.5%
Don't Know	3.2%

Q7a: Has your employer provided you with any training?

Yes	21.6%
No	78.4%

Q7b: Type of training:

English	64.3%
Technical	78.6%
Other	31.1%

Q7c: Where did the training occur:

At the work site	78.6%
Elsewhere	21.4%

Q8: Have you taken any time off from work in the last 12 months due to an accident at work?

Yes	7.8%
No	91.2%

Q9: On average, how much do you usually earn per hour for working? (primary job)

Decline to state	11.1%
Under $4.25 per hour	1.9%
$4.25 per hour	3.2%
Between $4.26 and $6.25 per hour	25.0%
Between $6.26 and $8.25 per hour	31.0%
Between $8.26 and $10.25 per hour	17.1%
Between $10.26 and $12.25 per hour	4.6%
$12.26 or more per hour	6.0%

Q10: Have the English language classes you have taken for Amnesty helped you:

Q10a: with your job (understanding directions, safety, etc.)?

Yes	68.6%
No	31.4%

Q10b: to get a pay raise or to get a better paying job?

Yes	31.8%
No	68.2%

Q10c: to understand American culture?

Yes	80.1%
No	19.9%

Q11: Do you intend to become a naturalized citizen after November 1991?

Yes	51.7%
No	28.3%
Unsure	19.9%

Q12: Are there any steps remaining for you to complete before naturalization?

Yes	57.1%
No	34.3%
Unsure	8.6%

Q13: Other than learning English, do you have a ***current*** educational goal or any goal that would require you to go to school?

10.4%	To gain skills so I can get a job
3.2%	To improve my job skills to get a better job
.4%	Parenting/raising children in America
.7%	Some college, no degree
8.6%	A 2-year college degree
5.0%	A 4-year college degree
2.2%	A graduate/professional degree
5.0%	A professional/vocational License
10.8%	Other
53.6%	None

Q14: Have you reached the level of English Language usage you desire?

Yes	17.1%
No	82.9%

Q15: What kind of job would you like to have 5 years from now?

No Answer	10.0%
Gave Answer	70.3%
Not Sure	19.7%

(Question 16 asked about times for classes)

Q17: What problems (do you have which) prevent you from taking more language or training courses?

7.2%	Don't Wish any more classes
41.6%	Child care responsibilities
32.8%	Conflicting times with Work
4.8%	Conflicts with household/family responsibilities
3.8%	Transportation (to or from)
6.5%	Cost/Fees
4.1%	Lost Income
.3%	Admission Policy -- restriction of non-citizen
18.1%	Other

Q18: How often do you use English at home?.

3.8%	All the time -- 100%
8.9%	Often -- 75%
16.4%	Sometimes -- 50%
26.7%	Seldom -- 25%
44.2%	Never -- 0%

Q19: Among your friends and neighbors, how often do you use English?

8.9%	All the time -- 100%
6.2%	Often -- 75%
14.7%	Sometimes -- 50%
19.5%	Seldom -- 25%
50.7%	Never -- 0%

Q20: While at work (if employed), how often do you use English?

33.9%	All the time -- 100%
20.5%	Often -- 75%
11.6%	Sometimes -- 50%
18.8%	Seldom -- 25%
15.2%	Never -- 0%

Copyright © (English and translations) 1990 Spicer/Sanchez. All rights reserved.

APPENDIX C
Amnesty Sub-Sample Responses
STATEWIDE SURVEY
OF ESL STUDENT POPULATIONS
SPRING, 1989

SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION:

Los Angeles County	699	13 colleges
Orange County	1,426	3 colleges
Other Areas	473	10 colleges
Total	*2,598*	*26 colleges*

AGE:

17 & under	7	.3%
18 to 21	273	10.7%
22 to 25	509	20.0%
26 to 30	624	24.5%
31 to 35	459	18.0%
36 to 40	312	12.2%
41 to 55	311	12.2%
56 & over	56	2.2%
missing	47	

LEVEL OF INSTRUCTION:

Amnesty	49	1.9%
Literacy	187	7.2%
NC Level 1	746	28.7%
NC Level 2	445	17.1%
NC Level 3	318	12.2%
NC Level 4	153	5.9%
NC Level 5	99	3.8%
NC Level 6	24	.9%
(Credit programs)		
3 or 4 Levels <FC	28	1.1%
2 Levels < FC	468	18.0%
1 Level < FC	47	1.8%
Fresh Comp.	6	.2%
Unknown	28	1.1%

STUDENTS INDICATING AGENCY SUPPORT FROM:

Amnesty	2598	100.0%
AWARE	3	.1%
CARE	4	.2%
EOPS	25	1.0%
GAIN	3	.1%
JPTA	1	.0%
Refugee	5	.2%

Q1: Which of the following best describes your reason for attending ESL classes?

17.3% To train for my first job or a better job.
19.4% To pursue a college program or degree.
19.8% To qualify for citizenship.
7.1% To help my children succeed.
36.3% To pursue personal growth and interests.

Q2: How important is it for you to learn to understand spoken English?

83.7% Highly important
14.5% Very important
1.2% Somewhat important
.4% Not very important
.3% Not at all important

Q3: How important is it for you to learn to speak English?

82.4% Highly important
15.7% Very important
1.5% Somewhat important
.2% Not very important
.2% Not at all important

Q4: How important is it for you to learn to read English?

79.6% Highly Important
18.1% Very Important
1.9% Somewhat Important
.2% Not Very Important
.1% Not At All Important

Q5: How important is it for you to learn to write English?

77.2% Highly Important
20.0% Very Important
2.1% Somewhat Important
.6% Not Very Important
.2% Not At All Important

Q6: How long do you think it will take you to learn English?

6.0% Less than 1 year
19.2% 1 year
31.1% 2 years
22.9% 3 years
7.9% 4 years
12.9% 5 or more years

Q7: What language did you learn first as a child?

.5%	Arabic	.5%	Persian
.3%	Armenian	.0%	Russian
1.0%	Cambodian/Laotian	93.6%	Spanish
.7%	Chinese -- any dialect	.2%	Tagalog
.3%	Hmong	.3%	Vietnamese
.6%	Japanese	1.4%	Other
.5%	Korean		

Q8: How often do you use English at home?

3.6%	All the time
16.8%	Often
49.9%	Sometimes
22.8%	Seldom
6.9%	Never

Q9: While at work, how often do you use English?

20.9%	All the time
28.2%	Often
30.1%	Sometimes
9.1%	Seldom
3.5%	Never
8.1%	NOT EMPLOYED/don't work outside the home

Q10: Among your friends and neighbors, how often do you use English?

4.6%	All the time
16.4%	Often
45.2%	Sometimes
24.9%	Seldom
9.0%	Never

Q11: How much time do you spend <u>each day</u> reading English newspapers or magazines?

19.6%	None
39.5%	5 to 15 minutes each day
25.8%	16 to 30 minutes each day
9.2%	31 to 60 minutes each day
5.8%	61 or more minutes each day

Q12: How much time do you spend <u>each day</u> watching English language television?

7.2%	None
29.4%	Less than 1 hour each day
46.0%	1 to 2 hours each day
12.8%	3 to 4 hours each day
4.6%	5 or more hours each day

Q13: Including yourself, how many people live in your home?

1.9%	One
7.1%	Two
12.4%	Three
19.2%	Four
23.2%	Five
36.2%	Six or more

Q14: How many people in your home are 18 years of age or older?

7.9%	None
9.6%	One
24.4%	Two
19.1%	Three
16.3%	Four
10.2%	Five
12.5%	Six or more

Q15: How many people in your home, 18 years and older, cannot read and write in any language?

79.5%	None
10.0%	One
4.5%	Two
2.3%	Three
1.5%	Four
.9%	Five
1.3%	Six or more

Q16: How many people in your home, 18 years and older, cannot read and write in English?

29.8%	None
19.9%	One
21.8%	Two
11.7%	Three
7.4%	Four
4.4%	Five
5.0%	Six or more

Q17: How many people in your home, 18 years and older, need to learn English?

9.6%	None
19.0%	One
29.5%	Two
15.0%	Three
10.7%	Four
7.2%	Five
9.0%	Six or more

Q18: How many people in your home, 18 years and older, are currently in school to learn English?

12.6%	None
30.6%	One
29.9%	Two
12.4%	Three
8.7%	Four
3.6%	Five
2.2%	Six or more

Q19: How many people in your home are between 13 and 17 years of age?

67.5%	None
16.9%	One
9.4%	Two
3.8%	Three
1.3%	Four
.6%	Five
.6%	Six or more

Q20: How many people in your home, between 13 and 17, are currently in school?

67.4%	None
16.1%	One
9.9%	Two
3.5%	Three
1.9%	Four
.6%	Five
.6%	Six or more

Q21: How many people in your home, between 13 and 17, need to improve their ability to read and write English?

70.2%	None
12.6%	One
7.9%	Two
4.0%	Three
2.0%	Four
1.2%	Five
2.1%	Six or more

Q22: How many people do you know, outside of your home, who would like to take an English class?

18.8%	None
12.4%	One
14.7%	Two
9.7%	Three
7.4%	Four
5.5%	Five
31.4%	Six or more

Q23: Besides learning English, which of the following best describes your educational goals?

16.3%	To gain skills so that I can get a job
45.7%	To improve my job skills to get a better job
4.7%	Some college, no degree
7.5%	A 2-year college degree
6.0%	A 4-year college degree
3.3%	A Master's degree
1.1%	A Law degree
1.4%	A doctoral degree in Medicine
.9%	A doctoral degree in another area
11.4%	To qualify for a professional or vocational license
1.6%	None

Q24: How long do you think it will take to achieve your educational goals?

2.3%	Less than 1 year
7.9%	1 year
25.8%	2 years
24.4%	3 years
25.8%	4 years
13.9%	Does not Apply

Q25: How likely do you think it is that you will finish your educational goals?

32.1%	Definitely
49.5%	Probably
14.4%	Maybe
2.5%	Unlikely
1.5%	Not at all

Q26: When did you first enter the United States with the intent to live permanently in the United States?

4.7%	1988
3.4%	1987
3.8%	1986
11.8%	1985
4.4%	1984
2.7%	1983
3.5%	1982
18.9%	1981
11.6%	1980
24.8%	1975-79
7.6%	1974 or before
2.7%	Am not intending to stay

Q27: When did you first enter California with the intent to live permanently in California?

5.0%	1988
4.4%	1987
4.5%	1986
11.5%	1985
4.7%	1984
2.6%	1983
3.8%	1982
17.7%	1981
11.1%	1980
24.3%	1975-79
7.4%	1974 or before
3.1%	Am not intending to stay

Q28: Which of the following best describes your ethnic/nationality background?

1.7%	(North) Am. Indian
.0%	Black
.4%	Armenian
.3%	Cambodian
.3%	Caribbean
15.3%	Central American
.6%	Chinese
.7%	European (White)
.3%	Filipino
.7%	Iranian/Persian
.4%	Japanese
.4%	Korean
.5%	Laotian
72.9%	Mexican
.2%	Pacific Islander
3.1%	South American
.6%	Vietnamese
.4%	Other Middle Easterner
.5%	Other Asian
.8%	None of the above

Q29: How many years of school did you finish before coming to the United States?

3.4%	None
2.1%	One
3.1%	Two
5.7%	Three
4.5%	Four
5.0%	Five
23.0%	Six
4.7%	Seven
4.7%	Eight
12.6%	Nine
4.1%	Ten
5.0%	Eleven
9.8%	Twelve
3.8%	Thirteen
2.8%	Fourteen
2.0%	Fifteen
3.7%	Sixteen or more

Q30: Did you graduate from high school before coming to the United States?

26.6%	Yes
73.4%	No

Q31: Did you attend high school in the United States?

91.5%	No
5.5%	Yes - did not graduate
3.0%	Yes - graduated

Q32: How many <u>years</u> of English did you study before coming to the United States?

72.4%	None
10.8%	One
4.9%	Two
6.7%	Three
1.4%	Four
1.4%	Five
2.4%	Six or more

Q33: Before taking this class, how many <u>semesters</u> of English classes have you taken in the United States?

44.2%	None
20.2%	One
14.7%	Two
9.0%	Three
5.2%	Four
2.2%	Five
4.5%	Six or more

Q34: What is your gender/sex?

58.7%	Male/Man
41.3%	Female/Woman

Q35: Which of the following best describes your current marital status?

36.8%	Single - no children
13.0%	Single - with children
7.6%	Married - no children
42.7%	Married - with children

Q36: How many hours of work are you paid for each week?

14.1%	None/Not working
1.7%	1-5
3.6%	6-10
1.9%	11-15
2.3%	16-20
4.2%	21-30
49.9%	31-40
22.3%	Over 40

Q37: On average, how much do you usually earn per hour for working?

14.0%	Not employed
4.5%	Under $4.25 per hour
15.3%	$4.25 per hour
34.5%	Between $4.26 and $6.25 per hour
18.3%	Between $6.26 and $8.25 per hour
8.2%	Between $8.26 and $10.25 per hour
3.1%	Between $10.26 and $12.25 per hour
2.0%	$12.26 or more per hour

Q38: Including this class, how many hours are you attending school <u>each week</u>?

8.8%	1 to 3 hours a week
14.8%	4 to 5 hours a week
30.2%	6 to 9 hours a week
16.5%	10 to 11 hours a week
29.7%	12 or more hours a week

Q39: Before this semester, how many college units have you completed in the United States?

92.8%	0 to 15 units
3.8%	16 to 29 units
2.0%	30 to 59 units
.5%	60 to 89 units
1.0%	90 or more units

Q40: Would the availability of campus child care help you succeed with your current educational goals?

41.7% Definitely
20.0% Probably
12.6% Don't know/maybe
2.4% Unlikely
23.3% Not at all

Q41: Would academic counseling (such as assistance with course selection) help you succeed with your current educational goals?

50.8% Definitely
31.6% Probably
12.7% Don't know/maybe
1.5% Unlikely
3.3% Not at all

Q42: Would financial aid (such as scholarships and loans to cover school fees, books, and living expenses) help you succeed with your current educational goals?

49.5% Definitely
26.5% Probably
14.6% Don't know/maybe
2.4% Unlikely
7.1% Not at all

Q43: Would more campus opportunities to interact with English-speaking Americans help you succeed with your current educational goals?

60.5% Definitely
27.5% Probably
8.5% Don't know/maybe
1.7% Unlikely
1.9% Not at all

Q44: Would health counseling (such as help with illness prevention, eating and nutrition information, family planning counseling, and other health information) help you succeed with your current educational goals?

50.9% Definitely
29.0% Probably
12.3% Don't know/maybe
2.5% Unlikely
5.3% Not at all

Q45: Would career planning (such as help with understanding the requirements for entering different jobs) help you succeed with your current educational goals?

58.3% Definitely
29.3% Probably
8.8% Don't know/maybe
1.2% Unlikely
2.4% Not at all

Q46: Would handicapped services (such as special services for the blind, deaf, physically impaired, etc.) help you succeed with your current educational goals?

24.8% Definitely
19.6% Probably
16.9% Don't know/maybe
4.3% Unlikely
34.4% Not at all

Q47: Would on-campus legal/immigration assistance help you succeed with your current educational goals?

57.1% Definitely
24.0% Probably
9.1% Don't know/maybe
2.3% Unlikely
7.5% Not at all

Q48: Would job placement assistance (such as referrals to job openings) help you succeed with your current educational goals?

51.4% Definitely
29.6% Probably
10.6% Don't know/maybe
1.8% Unlikely
6.6% Not at all

Q49: Would extra tutoring (such as one-on-one assistance with your class work outside of the classroom) help you succeed with your current educational goals?

47.9% Definitely
31.1% Probably
12.3% Don't know/maybe
2.7% Unlikely
5.9% Not at all

Q50: Would library services (such as tours, and instruction on how to use the library) help you succeed with your current educational goals?

53.2% Definitely
30.1% Probably
12.0% Don't know/maybe
1.8% Unlikely
3.0% Not at all

Q51: Would an introduction to the American college system, explaining what the college expects from you, and what you can expect from the college help you succeed with your current educational goals?

48.0% Definitely
32.6% Probably
14.4% Don't know/maybe
2.1% Unlikely
3.0% Not at all

Q52: How would you rate the instruction you have had at this college in your English class(es)?

62.3% Excellent
30.5% Good
5.0% Fine
1.0% Poor
1.2% No Opinion

Q53: How comfortable do you feel in the United States?

51.5% Always comfortable
35.7% Usually comfortable
11.9% Sometimes comfortable
.8% Seldom comfortable
.2% Never comfortable

Copyright © (English and translations) 1988, 1989 Spicer/Ali/Sanchez. All rights reserved.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

JUL 10 1992